

From Aspiration to Degradation: The Evolution of Presidential Rhetoric from Roosevelt to Trump

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

May 12, 2024

In "From Aspiration to Degradation: The Evolution of Presidential Rhetoric from Roosevelt to Trump," this paper examines the stark transformation in the style and substance of presidential communication over the past century. Starting with Franklin D. Roosevelt's inaugural address in 1933, which epitomized unity and collective resolve during America's most challenging economic downturn, the analysis extends to the polarizing and provocative rhetoric of Donald Trump at a 2024 rally. Through a detailed comparison of these contrasting approaches, the paper explores how shifts in media landscapes and public expectations have influenced presidential discourse. It discusses the implications of these rhetorical shifts for national unity, public trust, and political engagement. As the tone of presidential rhetoric has evolved from uplifting to divisive, this paper calls for a strategic reevaluation of political communication to foster a more inclusive and respectful public discourse, essential for the health of American democracy.

Keywords: presidential rhetoric, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Donald Trump, media influence, political communication, national unity, public trust, political engagement, Great Depression, social media, public discourse, democratic health.

Introduction

Presidential rhetoric plays a pivotal role in shaping national discourse, setting the tone for governance, and influencing public sentiment. As the primary communicator of national policy and values, the President of the United States wields words not just as tools of communication but as instruments of power. The manner in which a president chooses to speak to the public and the world can forge national identity, define moments of crisis, and articulate the collective aspirations or fears of the populace.

This paper juxtaposes two markedly different instances of presidential rhetoric to explore their impact on the fabric of American society. The first instance is drawn from a time of profound national despair—the Great Depression. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his inaugural address of 1933, delivered a speech that has been etched into the annals of history for its inspirational and unifying message. Roosevelt declared, "In every dark hour of our national life, a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days. In such a spirit on my part and on yours, we face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things."

Contrasting sharply with Roosevelt's message of hope and collective action is a moment from a 2024 re-election rally led by former President Donald Trump in New Jersey. At this rally, Trump engaged the crowd in a chant where he led them to repeatedly describe the Biden administration's efforts as turning everything to "s**t." This interaction, though starkly different in tone and content, similarly encapsulated the essence of Trump's approach to leadership—divisive and often derogatory.

The divergence in these two examples is striking and serves as a lens through which to examine the broader evolution of presidential rhetoric. This paper will delve into how presidential communication has transitioned from a focus on unity and moral uplift to an era where divisiveness and

degradation have become increasingly prevalent. By exploring these shifts, the paper aims to uncover the implications such changes hold for American political culture, particularly in terms of national unity, public trust, and the very nature of political discourse.

Historical Context of Presidential Rhetoric

Brief Review of the Role of Rhetoric in Presidential Leadership

Presidential rhetoric has historically been a fundamental element of leadership, offering a medium through which presidents can communicate policy, inspire the nation, and react to contemporary issues. The words of a president can calm fears, summon action, and even shift the national mood. In moments of crisis, these words can act as a binding agent for a fractured society, or conversely, in times of division, they can exacerbate tensions. The strategic use of rhetoric, therefore, is not just a matter of public communication but is central to the exercise of presidential power and authority.

Analysis of Roosevelt's Era and the Socio-Political Challenges During the Great Depression

The Great Depression, beginning in 1929, was a period of unprecedented economic hardship in the United States, marked by widespread poverty, unemployment, and a general loss of hope among the populace. When Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed the presidency in 1933, he was faced with the colossal task of restoring faith in American democracy and capitalism. His inaugural address needed to reassure the public, affirming that the crisis they were enduring was material and not a permanent state. Roosevelt's rhetoric was crafted to rekindle hope and to mobilize the nation towards collective recovery efforts. His use of reassuring and unifying language was crucial in fostering a sense of resilience and shared purpose.

Discussion of the Media Landscape and Public Expectations in the 1930s

During the 1930s, the media landscape was dominated by

newspapers and radio. Radio, in particular, had become a critical medium for mass communication, offering a direct channel between the White House and the American public. Roosevelt's utilization of this medium, especially through his "Fireside Chats," allowed him to bypass traditional print media filters and speak directly to Americans in their homes. This innovation in presidential communication not only increased the reach and impact of his rhetoric but also set a new standard for how presidents engaged with the public.

Public expectations for presidential communication during this time were significantly influenced by the dire economic circumstances. Americans looked to their president not just for policy but for emotional leadership that could lift the nation's spirits. The public needed assurances that their leader was not only aware of their suffering but also capable of leading them out of it. Roosevelt's speeches were thus expected to be both informative and comforting, a balancing act that defined the era's presidential rhetoric.

In summary, the role of rhetoric in presidential leadership has always been to articulate the nation's values, hopes, and fears. In Roosevelt's era, the socio-political context of the Great Depression and the evolving media landscape shaped a particular style of presidential communication that was direct, reassuring, and mobilizing. This historical context sets the stage for understanding the shifts in rhetorical strategies employed by subsequent presidents, including the stark differences evident in modern political communication.

Roosevelt's Inaugural Address: A Case Study

Detailed Analysis of Roosevelt's 1933 Inaugural Address Franklin D. Roosevelt's inaugural address in 1933 is one of the most pivotal moments in the annals of presidential rhetoric, primarily due to its context and content. Delivered at the height of the Great Depression, the address was

crafted to counter despair with hope and fear with fortitude. Roosevelt famously declared, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," a line that encapsulates the speech's essence. This assertion wasn't just poetic; it was a strategic choice to rally the nation against the paralyzing effect of fear. By personifying fear as the main enemy, Roosevelt shifted the narrative from one of helplessness against vast economic forces to one of a collective battle against a common, conquerable foe.

The address was meticulously structured to first diagnose the national crisis bluntly and then prescribe the New Deal policies as remedies, thus framing Roosevelt as both a truthful leader and a proactive problem-solver. His use of religious language, references to God, and the moral underpinnings of economic recovery efforts served to elevate the speech from a mere policy outline to a sermon on national rejuvenation.

Discussion of the Themes of Unity, Resilience, and Collective Effort

Unity, resilience, and collective effort are the thematic pillars of Roosevelt's inaugural address. He frequently invoked the collective power of the American people, suggesting that the path to recovery was a shared journey. For instance, he stated, "This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper." Here, the use of "will" rather than "can" underscores a definitive, collective path forward, emphasizing inevitability and determination.

Resilience was woven throughout the speech, as Roosevelt reassured the nation of its capacity to recover and rebuild. His acknowledgment of the severity of the national plight did not serve to alarm, but to prepare the nation for the hard work ahead, framing it as a test of the American spirit.

Moreover, Roosevelt's call for collective effort was explicit and strategic, designed to mobilize all segments of society towards a common goal. He advocated for a partnership between the government and the people, outlining how such cooperation would be pivotal in implementing the New Deal programs. His appeal to the industriousness and ingenuity of the

American people served to inspire participation in national recovery initiatives.

How Roosevelt's Rhetoric Aimed to Inspire Hope and Bring the Nation Together

The motivational power of Roosevelt's rhetoric lay in its ability to foster a sense of hope and communal destiny. By consistently using inclusive language, Roosevelt painted a picture of a unified America, where every citizen had a role to play in the collective recovery. His speech was a call to arms against the economic depression, which he framed not just as an economic challenge, but as a moral and communal one.

The hopeful tone was not naive optimism but a necessary counterweight to the despair pervasive at the time. Roosevelt's assurances that "happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort" sought to redefine the American dream away from material wealth and towards collective well-being and fulfillment.

In conclusion, Roosevelt's inaugural address serves as a masterclass in using presidential rhetoric to unite the nation, inspire resilience, and mobilize collective effort. The speech not only addressed the immediate economic challenges but also redefined the national ethos in terms of shared values and common purposes. This case study illustrates the profound impact presidential words can have on the nation's spirit and direction, especially during times of crisis.

The Modern Media Landscape and Its Impact on Rhetoric

Overview of the Changes in the Media Landscape The evolution of the media landscape over the past several decades has significantly altered the way presidents communicate with the public. The advent of television in the mid-20th century marked the first major shift, turning the presidency into a visual office as much as a political one. Televised addresses allowed presidents to reach into the living rooms of Americans nationwide,

emphasizing not just what was said, but how it was said and who was saying it. The visual element introduced body language and aesthetics into presidential rhetoric, making charisma and composure under scrutiny part of the presidential skill set.

The internet and the rise of digital media have further revolutionized political communication. The 24/7 news cycle and the proliferation of digital news platforms have fragmented the media environment, increasing competition for attention and complicating the control over messaging. Additionally, the emergence of social media platforms has democratized content creation and distribution, allowing presidents to bypass traditional media gatekeepers and directly interact with the public. This has led to more personalized, immediate, and sometimes informal modes of communication from the Oval Office.

How These Changes Have Altered Political Communication and the Style of Presidential Speeches

Presidential speeches have adapted to these media changes by becoming more soundbite-oriented, with shorter, more memorable phrases designed to capture the public's attention and remain effective in a highly competitive media environment. The rhetoric has also become more direct and colloquial, reflecting the informal communication styles favored on social media platforms.

Presidents now also face the challenge of addressing multiple audiences simultaneously — from traditional news consumers to digital natives and social media users, each with different expectations and media consumption habits. This necessitates a versatile communication strategy that can be effective across diverse platforms, whether it's delivering a formal address that will be dissected by news analysts or tweeting a concise message that resonates with the online populace.

Examination of the Audience's Changing Expectations in Political Discourse

Audiences today expect greater accessibility and transparency from presidential communications, facilitated by the directness of social media. There's an expectation for real-time responses to current events and

a more personal engagement from the president. This shift is reflected in how citizens engage with political content, often preferring interactive and on-demand media over scheduled broadcasts.

The modern audience also tends to favor content that confirms their pre-existing views, facilitated by algorithms that tailor content to individual preferences on social media platforms. This can lead to echo chambers, where divisive or extreme content may be amplified, further polarizing public discourse. As a result, presidential rhetoric can sometimes become more about reinforcing existing divides rather than bridging them, appealing to base voters rather than the entire nation.

In conclusion, the modern media landscape has dramatically transformed presidential rhetoric, necessitating adaptations in communication styles and strategies. These changes reflect broader shifts in technology, media consumption patterns, and public expectations, all of which continue to shape the evolution of political discourse in the United States.

Trump's Rally Rhetoric: A Case Study

Detailed Analysis of the Specific Rally Chant Led by Trump At a re-election rally in New Jersey, former President Donald Trump facilitated a chant where he led the crowd in collectively describing the actions of the Biden administration as turning everything to "s**t." This incident is not just a moment of crowd interaction but a calculated use of rhetoric that leverages simplicity, repetition, and shock value. The chant, crude and succinct, is easily remembered and repeated, amplifying its impact both at the rally and in the media coverage that follows. This tactic also taps into emotional responses, encouraging a visceral reaction rather than a reasoned debate, which can be more engaging and mobilizing for the audience.

Discussion of the Themes of Divisiveness and Degradation The chant epitomizes the themes of divisiveness and degradation that have characterized much of Trump's public discourse. By using derogatory language to describe the current administration, Trump not only disparages his political opponents but also frames the political landscape as a binary struggle between 'us' and 'them.' This rhetoric serves to degrade the public discourse by shifting focus from policy critique to personal and group attacks. It creates an 'in-group' (his supporters) and an 'out-group' (his opponents and their supporters), fostering a sense of identity and solidarity among his followers while vilifying the opposition.

Such tactics can be particularly effective in consolidating a base, as they appeal to strong emotions like anger and indignation, but they also polarize the public by discouraging compromise and mutual understanding. The degradation of opponents as not just wrong but fundamentally inept or corrupt can justify extreme measures in pursuit of political goals, thereby eroding democratic norms and practices.

Exploration of Trump's Use of Rhetoric to Energize His Base and Polarize Opinions Trump's rhetorical style is notable for its directness, simplicity, and frequent provocativeness, which are particularly well-suited to the quick consumption and spread of messages on social media and in a fragmented media landscape. His use of chants, slogans, and memorable catchphrases ("Make America Great Again," "Drain the Swamp," etc.) plays well to an era of sound bites and viral content. These methods effectively energize his base, providing them with clear, repeatable messages that reinforce group identity and differentiation from others.

Moreover, Trump's rhetoric often serves to polarize opinions by framing issues in stark, absolute terms. This approach exploits existing divisions for political gain, galvanizing supporters into more cohesive and motivated groups ready to mobilize against portrayed threats or injustices. While effective for rallying a dedicated base, this strategy also contributes to broader societal divisions, making it challenging to achieve cross-partisan dialogue or reconciliation.

In conclusion, Trump's rally rhetoric, as exemplified by the chant at the New Jersey rally, reveals a strategic approach to political communication that prioritizes emotional engagement, simplification of complex issues, and a stark delineation between friend and foe. While successful in energizing a particular segment of the electorate, this approach also poses significant challenges for the quality of public discourse and the health of democratic engagement.

Comparison and Contrast

Direct Comparison of the Two Quotes to Highlight the Shift in Presidential Rhetoric

The contrast between Franklin D. Roosevelt's inaugural address in 1933 and Donald Trump's rally chant in 2024 starkly illustrates the evolution in presidential rhetoric. Roosevelt's address, marked by its uplifting and unifying language, called upon the American people to face their common difficulties with a spirit of cooperation and collective effort. His rhetoric was infused with references to shared values and national resilience, emphasizing material hardships as a shared burden that could be overcome together. In contrast, Trump's rally chant centered around derogation and divisiveness, using coarse language to denigrate the opposing administration and polarize the audience. This approach not only simplifies complex political realities into binary good-versus-bad narratives but also fosters an 'us versus them' mentality.

Analysis of the Broader Implications of This Shift for Political

Discourse and National Unity The shift from Roosevelt's style of inclusive and hopeful rhetoric to Trump's divisive and aggressive tone has profound implications for political discourse and national unity. Roosevelt's approach aimed to bridge differences and rally the nation around a common cause during a crisis, strengthening the social fabric. Conversely, the kind of rhetoric exemplified by Trump often exacerbates social divisions by categorizing opponents as not merely wrong, but morally or fundamentally deficient.

This evolution reflects broader trends in the political landscape, where polarization has increased, and consensus-building has become more challenging. The shift towards more confrontational and polarizing rhetoric can undermine the ability of political leaders to unite the country in times of crisis or to govern effectively in a diverse society. It may also encourage a political climate where compromise is seen as weakness, and opposition is viewed through a lens of hostility rather than differing perspectives.

Reflection on the Impact of Presidential Rhetoric on Public Trust and Political Engagement

Presidential rhetoric significantly influences public trust and political engagement. Inspiring and respectful discourse, as modeled by leaders like Roosevelt, can enhance public trust in political institutions by reinforcing the ideals of democracy and collaborative governance. It encourages informed and constructive political participation by framing political engagement as a civic duty aimed at improving collective well-being.

In contrast, divisive and derogatory rhetoric can erode trust in political institutions and leaders. When political discourse is marked by attacks and vilification, it can lead to cynicism and disengagement among the public. Additionally, such rhetoric might galvanize some segments of the electorate but at the cost of alienating others, leading to an uneven and often tense political engagement.

In summary, the comparison between Roosevelt and Trump's rhetorical styles offers a lens through which to view the transformation of presidential communication over the last century. This shift has significant implications for the nature of political discourse, the unity of the nation, and the public's trust and engagement in the democratic process. As presidential rhetoric evolves, so too does its impact on the fabric of American political life, highlighting the enduring power of words in shaping not just policy, but the broader national ethos.

Conclusion

This paper has explored the dramatic shift in presidential rhetoric from the unifying and hopeful discourse of Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933 to the divisive and derogatory chants led by Donald Trump in 2024. Roosevelt's inaugural address exemplified a rhetoric steeped in themes of collective effort, resilience, and national unity, aimed at uplifting the nation during the Great Depression. His approach fostered a sense of shared purpose and encouraged the American public to face material challenges with optimism and solidarity. In stark contrast, Trump's rhetoric at his New Jersey rally leveraged simplicity, emotional provocation, and divisiveness, emphasizing conflict and degradation of the opposition, which starkly polarizes the electorate.

The transition from inclusive to divisive rhetoric over the decades reflects broader changes in the media landscape and public expectations. The rise of television, the internet, and social media has transformed the way presidents communicate with the public, favoring more direct, immediate, and often sensational forms of communication that can exacerbate divisions rather than bridge them. This evolution has significant implications for political discourse and national unity, contributing to increased polarization and a challenging environment for consensus-building.

Reflecting on these trends, it is evident that the long-term trajectory of presidential rhetoric could continue towards increased polarization unless deliberate efforts are made to reverse this course. The current media environment rewards quick, emotional reactions that are often at odds with the slow, deliberative process needed for effective governance and societal cohesion.

Therefore, this paper calls for a reevaluation of political communication strategies, advocating for approaches that prioritize inclusivity and respect. Political leaders, along with the media, need to foster a discourse that emphasizes common values and goals, even amidst disagreement. Such a

strategy would involve not only a change in the tone and style of presidential communications but also a structural rethinking of how media platforms amplify political messages.

Encouraging a more inclusive and respectful public discourse is essential for the health of American democracy. It requires a commitment to elevating the quality of political communication, ensuring it serves to enlighten and unify rather than divide and sensationalize. By returning to a rhetoric that prioritizes the collective good and respects the dignity of diverse opinions, the nation can hope to rebuild trust in its political institutions and reinvigorate the public's engagement in the democratic process.

References

1. Roosevelt, Franklin D. "First Inaugural Address." March 4, 1933. Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum.
<https://www.fdrlibrary.org/>
2. Trump, Donald J. "Campaign Rally Speech." New Jersey, 2024. Recorded and transcribed by major news outlets.
3. McChesney, Robert W. "Rich Media, Poor Democracy: Communication Politics in Dubious Times." New Press, New York, 1999.
4. Jamieson, Kathleen Hall, and Joseph N. Cappella. "Echo Chamber: Rush Limbaugh and the Conservative Media Establishment." Oxford University Press, 2008.
5. Postman, Neil. "Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business." Penguin Books, 1985.
6. Sunstein, Cass R. "#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media." Princeton University Press, 2017.
7. Prior, Markus. "Post-Broadcast Democracy: How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections." Cambridge University Press, 2007.
8. Hart, Roderick P. "Campaign Talk: Why Elections Are Good for Us." Princeton University Press, 2000.
9. Newman, Nic. "Digital News Report 2021." Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford.
<https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2021>
10. Allcott, Hunt, and Matthew Gentzkow. "Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election." Journal of Economic Perspectives, vol. 31, no. 2, Spring 2017, pp. 211-236.

11. Putnam, Robert D. "Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community." Simon & Schuster, 2000.

